

REMARKS

1. Amendments to the Drawings

Figures 1-6 have been amended and are now labeled as “prior art.”

2. Amendments to the Specification

5 The specification has been amended to reflect that Figures 7-23 are drawn in accordance with an embodiment of the invention.

3. Amendments to the Claims

 Independent claims 1, 9, and 15 have been amended to clearly indicate that the universal message handler is located on the mobile information device. Claim 1 has been
10 amended to correct a typographical error: “a Java MIDlet” replaces “*an* Java MIDlet.”

3. Summary of § 103 Rejection

 The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5, 7-10, 12-17 and 19-20 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0069263 (“Sears”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034853 (“Gibbons”); rejected claims 3-4 and
15 11 as being unpatentable over Sears in view of Gibbons further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publicatoin No. 2001/0034771 (“Hutsch”); and rejected claims 6 and 18 as being unpatentable over Sears in view of Gibbons further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,767 (“Wellner”).

3. The Claimed Invention

20 Claims 1-20 are pending, of which, claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent and the rest dependent. All the pending claims are directed, in one form or another, to methods

that can allow communication between Java MIDlets in different MIDlet suites and between non-MIDlet applications.¹ One type of data that can be passed between MIDlets is a Uniform Resource Identifier (“URI”). Data to be passed may initially be received by a universal message handler located on a mobile device and then routed to the appropriate MIDlet destination on the device.

Claim 1 provides a detailed method for one way that an application management system can allow a Java MIDlet executing on a mobile information device to access a universal message handler. A universal message handler receives a URI that references the Java MIDlet and a key associated with the URI. The application management system then makes a determination that the Java MIDlet is registered to handle the URI. Based on that determination, the Java MIDlet is launched on the mobile device and the URI and key are passed to the Java MIDlet. Consequently, the Java MIDlet gains access to the universal message handler by returning the key to the universal message handler.

Similarly, independent claims 9 and 15 both include limitations that a URI that references the Java MIDlet and a key associated with the URI are received and subsequently gaining access to the universal message handler by using the key.

4. The Cited References do not Obviate the Claimed Invention

Under M.P.E.P. § 2143, in order for a combination of references to render a claim obvious, the combination must disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that, because the cited combinations fail to disclose or suggest all the elements of the claims, the rejections should be withdrawn.

¹ Claims 2, 10, and 16 are directed to computer readable medium having stored therein instructions for causing a processor to execute steps of the methods.

In the Office Action, the Examiner primarily cited two references, Sears and Gibbons. However, neither Sears nor Gibbons discloses methods for allowing communication with Java MIDlets that are executed on a mobile device as claimed here. Rather, the two references are focused on ways to download and install the Java MIDlets (or other program applications) and do not delve into such operation of the Java MIDlets once installed. Particularly, Sears is directed to preprocessing Java applications and delivering preprocessed Java applications using wireless technology. (Sears, Abstract, Figure 1). Similarly, Gibbons is directed to providing adapted software applications for download and execution on mobile devices. (Gibbons, Abstract). The references generally fail to teach or suggest methods for communication with Java MIDlets being executed on a mobile device and, more specifically, do not teach or suggest the particular limitations claimed here. Because of the fundamental difference in scope and direction between the references and the claimed invention, these references taken as a whole cannot be used to obviate the claimed invention.

Two specific and fundamental failures of the references are disclosed below:

First, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest that both a URI associated with the Java MIDlet and a key associated with the URI are passed to the Java MIDlet, the key being operable for providing the Java MIDlet with access to the universal message handler. As explained in more detail above, this limitation is found in some form in each and every independent claim.

As the Examiner indicated, Sears is silent on the use of an URI. Furthermore, Gibbons' general disclosure of a URI does not teach or suggest that a URI be associated with a Java MIDlet or that the URI be passed to the Java MIDlet. Regarding a key

associated with the URI, Sears' disclosure security/authentication/trust does not teach or disclose passing a key associated with the URI to the Java MIDlet being executed on the mobile device, and that key being operable for providing the Java MIDlet with access to the universal message handler.

5 **Second, none of the references as cited by the examiner disclose or suggest a universal message handler located on the mobile device as clearly recited by each of the amended independent claims.** Particularly, in the rejection, the Examiner indicated that the Java Application Repository Server 101 disclosed in Sears (Figure 1) suggested the universal message handler. The Server 101, however, is used for storing program
10 applications and downloading them to a mobile device. The Server 101 is not a message handler, is not located on the mobile device, and does teach or suggest the claimed limitation.

As such, Applicant submits that the cited references, when examined either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of any of the
15 pending independent claims.

5. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are now in condition for allowance, and Applicant therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration.

Dated: January 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

By: 

Dennis D. Crouch
Reg. No. 55,091